STUDIES ON THE REGULATION OF *STR3* **IN** *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*

A dissertation submitted for the partial fulfilment of BS-MS dual degree in Science

By

Bindia Chawla

To the

Department of Biological Sciences

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Mohali

April 2017

Certificate of Examination

This is to certify that dissertation titled **" STUDIES ON THE REGULATION OF** *STR3* **IN** *Saccharomyces cerevisiae "*submitted by Ms. Bindia Chawla (MS12045) for the partial fulfilment of BS-MS dual degree programme of the Institute, has been examined by the thesis committee duly appointed by the Institute. The committee finds the work done by the candidate satisfactory and recommends that the report be accepted.

 Dr. Shravan K.Mishra Dr. Kavita Babu Prof. Anand Kumar Bachhawat (Supervisor)

Dated: April 21,2017

Declaration

The work presented in this dissertation has been carried out by me under the guidance of Prof. A.K. Bachhawat at the Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Mohali. This work has not been submitted in part or in full for a degree, a diploma, or a fellowship to any other university or institute. Whenever contributions of others are involved, every effort is made to indicate this clearly, with due acknowledgement of collaborative research and discussions. This thesis is a bonafide record of original work done by me and all sources listed within have been detailed in the bibliography.

Bindia Chawla

Date: April 21,2017

In my capacity as the supervisor of the candidate's project work, I certify that the above statements by the candidate are true to the best of my knowledge.

> Prof. Anand Kumar Bachhawat (Supervisor)

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my special thanks of gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Anand K. Bachhawat for mentoring me for the past one year and for giving me freedom to think about my experiments. This project would never have been so fruitful without his help and support.

Muskan Bhatia is the first person to whom I should thank, she helped me throughout this project, spent a lot of her time in my project discussions and for correcting my BS-MS dissertation. I would also like to thank Shambhu Yadav, Amandeep Kaur and M. Zulkifli for all those valuable tea discussions. Avinash Chandel for giving me his advice about not only my project but also on career path. Prarthna and Harsha have been my good friends, I have enjoyed several funs with them. My scientific progress would never have been possible without the influence of Anup Deshpande, *Manisha, Banani Mam,Tejasvinee and all AKB lab members.*

I would like to take this opportunity to specially thank my family who always supported me. My parents and my sisters for their love, support and encouragement which always have been the driving force for all my achievements.

I thank Almighty God for his countless blessings and guiding me during my educational journey.

LIST OF FIGURES

Introduction

Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of sulphur metabolism in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae.*

Results and Discussion

Figure 3.1: Schematic representation of chromosomal locus of *STR3.*

Figure 3.2: Phylogenetic footprinting of ~600bp region of *STR3* promoter of different *Saccharomyces* species.

Figure3.3: Phylogenetic footprinting of *STR3* promoters of different *Saccharomyces* species.

Figure3.4: Schematic representation of conserved motifs present in *STR3* promoter and transcription factors predicted by YEASTRACT.

Figure3.5: Showing all the putative transcription factors which can bind to conserved sequences present in *STR3* promoter.

Figure3.6: Schematic representation of in-frame fusion product of STR3-promoter-GFP reporter construct.

Figure3.7: Effect of methionine, cysteine and glutathione on *STR3* and *MET15* expression.

Figure3.8: *STR3* regulation in strains deleted for different transcription factors.

Figure3.9: Schematic representation of constructs made for deletion analysis of *STR3 promoter*.

Figure3.10: Deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter by methionine and glutathione sulphur sources.

Figure3.11: Identification of functionally important MET31/32 motifs in *STR3* promoter through mutational analysis.

Figure3.12: Effects of elevated levels of extracellular cystine on *STR3* regulation in wild type and *yct1∆ strain*

Figure3.13: Effect of different nitrogen sources and regulators of nitrogen pathway on *STR3* regulation.

Figure3.14: Checking transcriptional block at *STR3* step in *met12∆met15∆*.

Figure3.15: Yeast two hybrid assay.

List of Tables

Table1: List of bacterial and yeast strains

Table2: List of Plasmids

Table3: List of Oligonucleotides and their sequences

ABBREVIATIONS

Weights and measures

Symbols

Techniques

PCR Polymerase Chain Reaction

Chemicals

Miscellaneous

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1 Introduction

SECTION B: METHODS

de-repressed and repressed conditions...25

3.4 Deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter in sulphur

Abstract

The *STR3* gene of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* encodes the enzyme cystathionine beta lyase. This enzyme of the sulphur pathway converts cystathionine to homocysteine. *STR3* is known to be under sulphur regulation, but recent studies have suggested that the regulation of *STR3* might be more complex. Phylogenetic analysis of the *STR3* promoter was carried out to initially identify conserved motifs in the promoter. This was followed up by expression analysis of the *STR3* promoter using STR3-GFP reporter fusions. The role of the conserved motifs were investigated by deletion analysis and also by examining expression in different transcription factor deletion backgrounds. This analysis suggested a role for *GCN4* in achieving full sulphur derepression. We also investigated the roles of the three *MET31/MET32* motifs present in the *STR3* promoter but could not find a role, as seen by the mutation of individual motifs. *STR3* also did not appear to be upregulated by intracellular cystine based on the reporter gene fusion studies, nor was it affected by the *MET12* gene product. A two hybrid analysis of Met12p –Str3p interaction revealed that the two proteins do not appear to physically interact.

Chapter 1

Introduction and Review of Literature

1 Introduction

1.1 Importance of Sulphur

Sulphur is one of the essential elements required for the growth of living organisms. Sulphur is a building block of many important organic molecules like enzymes, vitamins, proteins and also of two amino acids- methionine and cysteine. Sulphur is also a constituent of glutathione which is the most important antioxidant molecule providing protection to cellular components from reactive oxygen species. Sulphur is present in many compounds with oxidative states ranging from -2 to +6. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* has evolved the ability to use a wide range of inorganic and organic sulphur sources.

1.2 Sulphur Assimilation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*

In the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, uptake of inorganic sulphur compounds like sulphates occurs through the high affinity sulphate transporters *SUL1* and *SUL2*. The intracellular sulphate is then converted to sulphide through a series of steps. Homocysteine synthase (*MET15*) then helps in the conversion of sulphide to homocysteine. Homocysteine pools are then used for the production of methionine, cysteine and glutathione (Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997). In reverse trans-sulphuration pathway, homocysteine first converts to cystathionine by cystathionine β synthase (*STR4*) and subsequently to cysteine by cystathionine γ lyase (*CYS3*). These cysteine pools are further used for protein synthesis and production of glutathione. From cysteine, homocysteine can be produced via two successive reactions of trans-sulphuration pathway. In the first reaction cysteine is converted to cystathionine. This reaction is catalyzed by cystathionine γ synthase (*STR2*). The second step converts cystathionine to homocysteine by cystathionine β lyase (*STR3*).

Methionine is produced from homocysteine by means of homocysteine methyltransferase (*MET6*).Methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase (*MET13*) reduces methylene tetrahydrofolate to methyl tetrahydrofolate which later donates a methyl group to homocysteine for the conversion to methionine.

1.3 Sulphur regulation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*

MET4,*MET28*,*CBF1*,*MET30*,*MET31* and *MET32* are the genes which codes for principle transcription factors involved in sulphur regulation of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae.*(Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).Met4p is the main transcriptional activator of sulphur metabolic network, whereas Met28p,Cbf1p,Met31p and Met32p act as adaptors for binding of Met4p to its target promoters (Lee et al., 2010). CACGTG and AAACTGTGGC are the two main cis-regulatory elements identified to be involved in regulation of sulphur pathway genes (Lee et al., 2010; Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).

Met4p is a basic leucine zipper domain (bZIP) containing factor which is the main transcription activator of sulphur pathway genes. Met4p itself lacks intrinsic DNA binding ability and depends on DNA-binding cofactor proteins- Cbf1p, Met31p and Met32p to reach its target promoters (Lee et al., 2010; Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).

Met28p is also a basic leucine zipper domain (bZIP) containing factor which itself lacks any intrinsic transcription activation function but is known to be positive regulator of transcription of many *MET* genes. Met28p is known to stabilize binding of Cbf1p-Met4p

and Met31p/Met32p-Met4p complexes to DNA (Lee et al., 2010; Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997)

Cbf1p is a basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) domain containing factor and this domain helps Cbf1p to bind to TCACGTG sequence (Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).

Met30p functions as a transcriptional inhibitor of Met4p under repressive conditions. Under repressive sulphur conditions, Met30p leads to polyubiquitylation of Met4p further leading to its proteolysis (Lee et al., 2010; Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).

Met31p and Mte32p are two zinc-finger containing proteins which like Cbf1 provides DNA binding ability to Met4p. Both of them help in transcriptional activation but in Met4p dependent manner and binds to the consensus sequence AAACTGTGGC (Lee et al., 2010; Thomas and SurdinKerjan, 1997).

1.4 Transcriptional regulation of *STR3*

Cystathionine, an intermediate in sulphur metabolic pathway is converted to homocysteine by cystathionine β lyase (*STR3*) and to cysteine by cystathionine γ lyase (*CYS3*)*.* Both *STR3* and *CYS3* are shown to be upregulated during sulphur limitation conditions (Boer et al., 2003; Tai et al., 2005). Increased expression of *STR3* has been reported in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* upon exposure to excess of cysteine along with cystathionine accumulation in the cell (Deshpande et al., 2017). Microarray profiles have also shown upregulation of *STR3* in sulphur limiting and *MET4* hyperactivation conditions (Lee et al., 2010). Also, strong upregulation of *STR3* gene has been shown by giving high levels of polyamines (spermidine) in media conditions.(Chattopadhyay et al., 2009)

1.5 Link between *MET12* **and** *STR3*

Methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase (*MET13*) reduces methylene tetrahydrofolate to methyl tetrahydrofolate which remethylates homocysteine to methionine, a step catalyzed by methionine synthase (*MET6*). *met13∆* and *met13∆met15∆* are methionine auxotrophs. *MET12* is proposed to be a homolog of *MET13* based on sequence similarity yet a

met12∆ strain grows well on all organic as well as inorganic sulphur sources unlike *met13∆*. Surprisingly, *met12∆met15∆* strain was unable to utilize GSH, cysteine as well as cystathionine as organic sulphur sources but was able to grow at homocysteine suggesting a block at cystathionine to homocysteine conversion step catalyzed by cystathionine β lyase (*STR3*) [Bhatia M. unpublished].

Aim and objective of the present study

The principal goal of this study was to identify possible novel elements in *STR3* regulation.

More specifically, we have listed out the following objectives:

- 1. A detailed *in-silico* analysis of the *STR3* promoter and identification of any motifs or transcription factor binding sites
- 2. Creation of an STR3-GFP reporter fusion and using this to investigate the *STR3* under a variety of nutrient and genetic backgrounds
- 3. To carry out a deletion analysis and a mutational analysis of critical elements of the *STR3* promoter
- *4.* To investigate possible interactions at the transcriptional level or the protein level between *STR3* and *MET12*

Chapter 2 *Materials and Methods*

SECTION A: MATERIALS

2.1. CHEMICALS AND REAGENTS

All the chemicals used were obtained from commercial sources and were of analytical grade. Media components, fine chemicals and reagents were purchased from Sigma Aldrich, (St. Louis, USA), HiMedia, (Mumbai, India), Merck. India Ltd (Mumbai, India), USB Corporation (Ohio, USA) or Difco, USA. Oligonucleotides (primers) were designed using Snapgene software and were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (IDT). Enzymes (Restriction enzymes, T4 DNA ligase, Calf Intestinal Phosphatase (CIP), Antarctic phosphatase, *Vent* DNA polymerase, *Taq* DNA polymerase and other modifying enzymes), their buffers and dNTPs were purchased from New England Biolabs Inc, (Beverly, MA, USA). Gel-extraction kits and plasmid miniprep columns were obtained from Bioneer. Methionine, GSH and cysteine were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich, USA.

2.2. STRAINS AND PLASMIDS

Escherichia coli DH5α was used as the cloning host. The genotype for the *E. coli* strain and the yeast strains used in the study are given in Table 1. The list of various plasmids used in this study is given in Table 2.

Table 1: List of bacterial and yeast strains used in the study

ABC 993 *EGY48 MATα trp1 his3 ura3 leu2::6LexAOp-LEU2* **Lab strain**

Table 2: List of Plasmids used in the study

 \mathbb{R}

2.3. OLIGONUCLEOTIDES

The list of various oligonucleotide primers used in this study is given in Table 3.

2.4. MEDIA

All the media, buffers and stock solutions were prepared using Millipore elix 5 deionized water unless otherwise mentioned. They were sterilized, as recommended, either by autoclaving at 15 lb/inch² (psi) pressures at 121^oC for 15 minutes, or by using membrane filters (Advanced Microdevices Pvt. Ltd., India) of pore size 0.22 µm (for heat labile compounds). Additional amino acid and nutrients were prepared as sterile stock and added as per requirements. Agar was added, if required, at a final concentration of 2.2%. Ampicillin was added at a final concentration of 100 μg/ml.

Table 3: List of Oligonucleotides and their sequences used in this study

2.5 BUFFERS AND STOCK SOLUTIONS

2.5.1. Ampicillin Stock Solution (100 mg/ml)

The required amount of ampicillin (sodium salt) was dissolved in the required volume of deionized water, and it was filter-sterilized using 0.2 μm filter membrane. It was stored at -20°C in aliquots in micro centrifuge tubes.

2.5.2. GSH Stock Solution (200 mM)

The required amount of glutathione (reduced form) was dissolved in 1 ml of deionized water and was filter-sterilized using 0.2 μm filter membrane. It was used for further dilutions and was stored at -20°C.

2.5.3. Methionine Stock Solution (200 mM)

The required amount of methionine was dissolved in 1 ml of deionized water and was filtersterilized using 0.2 μm filter membrane. It was used for further dilutions and stored at 4°C.

2.5.4. Cysteine Stock Solution (200 mM)

Fresh stock of cysteine was prepared by dissolving required amount of cysteine in1 ml of deionized water and was filter sterilized using 0.2 µm filter membrane.

2.5.5. 50% Glycerol (used for preparing –80°C stocks of *E. coli***)**

2.5.6. Alkaline Lysis Buffers (Plasmid DNA preparation from *E. coli***)**

2.5.7. Agarose Gel Electrophoresis Reagents

2.5.8. Solutions for preparation of chemical competent *E. coli* **cells [19]**

2.5.9. Yeast Transformation Solutions (*S. cerevisiae***) [20]**

- a) 0.1 M Lithium acetate in TE (pH 7.5)
- b) 50% PEG-3350 in 0.1 M Lithium acetate in TE (pH 7.5).

SECTION B: METHODS

2.6 Growth and maintenance of bacteria and yeast strains

The *Escherichia coli* strains $DH5\alpha$ was routinely grown at LB medium at 37^oC. *E. coli* transformants were selected and maintained on LB medium supplemented with ampicillin.

The *S. cerevisiae* strains were regularly maintained on YPD medium and grown at 28-30C. The yeast transformants were selected and maintained on SD medium with supplement as per requirements.

2.7 Recombinant DNA methodology (restriction digestion, ligation, transformation of *E. coli,* **PCR amplification etc.**

All the molecular techniques used in the study for manipulation of DNA, protein, bacteria and yeast were according to standard protocols (Kaiser et al., 2000; Sambrook et al., 1989) or as per manufacturers' protocol, unless specifically mentioned.

2.8 Growth of cells for induction

The STR3-promoter-GFP fusion construct was transformed in different strain backgrounds. Strains were grown overnight in complete media without uracil and reinoculated in fresh medium and grown in presence of different sulphur and nitrogen sources for 5 hours.

2.9 GFP Assay

After growing cells in different induction conditions, cells were harvested at 4°C, followed by washing with cold water and resuspended in water to an OD_{600} of 1.0 and GFP fluorescence was measured in a spectrophotometer at Excitation:488nm and Emission: 510nm.

2.10 Transformation of yeast

The transformation of *S. cerevisiae* strains was carried out by lithium acetate method. *S. cerevisiae* cultures were grown in YPD at 30^oC with shaking for 16-24 hrs and then reinoculated in fresh YPD to an initial OD_{600} of 0.1, cells were allowed to grow at 30 $^{\circ}$ C for 4-5 hrs with shaking. Cells were harvested at 6000 rpm for 5 min, then were washed with sterile water followed by subsequent wash with 0.1 M lithium acetate solution (prepared in TE, pH 7.5) and were finally resuspended in the same solution. Cells were incubated at 30° C for 30 min with shaking. The cells were spun down, suspended in 0.1 M lithium acetate solution to a cell density of 1×10^9 cells/ml and divided into 100 μ l aliquots. Approximately 50 μ g (5 μ l of 10 mg/ml stock solution) of heat denatured, salmon sperm carrier DNA, followed by 0.3μ g- 0.7μ g of plasmid/DNA fragment were added to each aliquot and whole cell suspension was incubated at 30° C for 30 min. After the incubation, 0.3 ml of 50% PEG 3350 (prepared in 0.1 M lithium acetate, pH 7.5) was added to each tube, mixed well and again kept at 30° C for 45 min. The cell suspensions were subjected to heat shock at 42° C for 10 min. and the cells were allowed to cool to room temperature. The cells were pelleted down at 7000 rpm for 3 min. The cell pellet was resuspended in sterile water and appropriate volume of cell suspension was plated on selection plates.

2.11 Construction of Site-directed mutants of STR3 promoter

The mutations in *STR3* promoter were introduced by site directed mutagenesis using the splice overlap extension strategy. The different mutagenic oligonucleotides pairs used for generation of these mutants are given in Table 2.

2.12 Yeast Two Hybrid assay

Yeast two hybrid studies were carried out using the DupLexA yeast two hybrid system of Origene technologies Inc., MD (USA). This system was initially described by R.Brent and co-workers (Gyuris *et al.*, 1993). pEG202 was used as the bait plasmid and *MET12* was expressed as a fusion protein with LexA DNA binding domain. pJG4-5 plasmid was used as the prey plasmid and *STR3* was expressed as a fusion protein with Gal4 activation domain. Interactions between the two proteins result in the formation of a transcriptional competent complex having both LexA DNA binding domain and Gal4 transcription activation domain. The interactions were checked using two reporters. pSH18-34 plasmid having 6LexAoperator upstream of β-galactosidase was used for Blue-White selection on X-Gal plates. Interaction among the two proteins results in the expression of β-galactosidase and blue colour on X-Gal plates. A second reporter was provided by the yeast strain (EGY48) used in the system. EGY48 has 6LexA-operator upstream of *LEU2* gene. Interaction among the two proteins results in the expression of *LEU2* and allows the growth on CM-Leu plates of the leucine auxotroph EGY48.

pSH17-4 was used as positive control. In this plasmid ADH1 promoter expresses a LexA-Gal4 fusion protein. pRFHM1 was used as a negative control in the study, its expresses LexA fused to homodomain of bicoid protein that does not function as an activation domain in yeast.

The three plasmids (Reporter, Bait pEG202-MET12 and Prey pJG4-5 STR3) were transformed into EGY48 strain and transformants were selected on SD-Ura-His-Trp+Leu plates. True transformants were patched on CM+Leu, CM-Leu and CM-X-Gal plates. Positive interactions show blue colour on CM+X-Gal plates and growth on CM-Leu plates. Bait constructs alone were also checked for the autoactivation. Repeated the same by using *STR3* in bait and *MET12* in prey.

Chapter 3 *Results and Discussion*

Results and Discussion

3.1 Phylogenetic footprinting of *STR3* **promoter reveals several conserved motifs**

Phylogenetic footprinting is a technique to identify conserved regions within non-coding regions of DNA by multiple sequence alignment of the orthologous sequences of closely related species (Kohli et al., 2004). This technique can be used to identify motifs with physiological significance.

Chromosomal Locus of STR3: Chromosome VII

Figure 3.1: Schematic representation of chromosomal locus of *STR3* showing intergenic distance of 531bp between *STR3* and its upstream gene *MND1*

To obtain insights on *STR3* regulation, we aligned ~600kb region of the *STR3* promoter of following *Saccharomyces* species - *S. cerevisiae, S. mikatae, S. paradoxus, S. uvarum, S. bayanus* and *S. kudriavzevii.*

The multiple sequence alignment is shown in Figure 3.2.

÷,

Sacc.para			
Sacc.uvar	981	ATACTAACAATCTAATCAAC	1000
Sacc.baya	981	ATACTAACAAGCGAATCAAC	1000
Sacc.kud	999		1000

Figure 3.2: Phylogenetic footprinting of ~600bp region of *STR3* promoter of different *Saccharomyces* species

The intergenic sequence was 531bp between *STR3* and upstream gene *MND1*(Figure 3.1)*.*We therefore focused on that region of the promoter.(Figure3.3)

Figure 3.3: Phylogenetic footprinting of *STR3* promoters of different *Saccharomyces* species. The yellow regions in blue boxes highlight conserved regions in *STR3* promoter.

The phylogenetic footprinting of *STR3* promoter revealed many conserved motifs. Using YEASTRACT database (Teixeira et al., 2014) we predicted transcription factors which can probably bind to these conserved sequences. (Figure 3.5)

Figure 3.4 : Schematic representation of conserved motifs present in *STR3* promoter and transcription factors predicted by YEASTRACT which may probably bind to these motifs.

Figure 3.5 : Showing all the putative transcription factors which can bind to conserved sequences present in *STR3* promoter along with observed and consensus sequences of transcription factors. The underlined regions correspond to transcription factor binding sites.

Brief description about putative transcription factors :-

Ume6- It is a histone deacetylase complex unit. It is a key regulator of nitrogen repression and meiotic development. (Strich et al., 1994).

Gln3- Gln3 is a transcriptional activator of genes which show nitrogen catabolite repression. Its localization and activity is regulated by Ure2p and quality of nitrogen sources (Daignan-Fornier and Fink, 1992).

Ure2- Transcriptional regulator of nitrogen catabolite repression and inhibits Gln3 transcription in good nitrogen sources. (Daignan-Fornier and Fink, 1992).

 Met31/Met32- These have been already described in the introduction.

Bas1:- It regulates basal and induced expression of genes of purine and histidine biosynthesis pathways. (Courchesne and Magasanik, 1988; Magasanik and Kaiser, 2002).

 Gcn4:- bZIP transcriptional activator of amino acid biosynthetic genes. It responds to amino acid starvation and its expression is tightly regulated at both the transcriptional and translational levels. (Hinnebusch and Natarajan, 2002).

Hac1:- bZIP transcription factor which regulates the unfolded protein response via UPRE binding and membrane biogenesis. ER stress-induced splicing pathway and DNA replication stress facilitates efficient Hac1p synthesis (Mori et al., 1996).

Yap1:- bZIP transcription factor which is required for oxidative stress tolerance. It also mediates resistance to cadmium and relative distribution to the nucleus increases upon DNA replication stress (Kuge et al., 1997; Okazaki et al., 2007).

Yap3:- bZIP transcription factor and it is like activator protein 1(AP-1) which is a transcription regulator that regulates gene expression in response to a variety of stimuli including cytokines, growth factors, stress, bacterial and viral infections (Fernandes et al., 1997).

3.2 Creation and validation of STR3-pro-GFP fusion construct

To investigate the regulation of *STR3* more systematically we created a STR3-GFP reporter in-frame fusion.(Figure3.6) Before proceeding toward the expression analysis of *STR3* under our experimental conditions, we first validated the STR3-pro-GFP construct, since *STR3* is known to be regulated by sulphur sources. We examined the expression of *STR3* under sulphur limiting conditions and compared the results with *MET15* whose upregulation in sulphur limiting conditions is also well established. The STR3-pro-GFP plasmids were transformed into the wild type yeast strain BY4742 (ABC734). The effect of different sulphur sources on *STR3* and *MET15* gene expression were examined by growing cells bearing either STR3-pro-GFP plasmids or MET15-pro-GFP plasmids in different sulphur sources like methionine, cysteine and glutathione (see Methods).

De-repression of both *STR3* and *MET15* was observed in sulphur limiting conditions confirming that STR3-pro-GFP construct was functional. The expression pattern of *STR3* reflects strong transcriptional repression by methionine and cysteine sulphur sources at 500µM. On the contrary, glutathione did not show any significant repression as it is known to be a non-repressing sulphur source.(Figure 3.7)

Figure 3.6: Schematic representation of in-frame fusion product of STR3-promoter-GFP reporter construct

3.3 Investigating the regulation of *STR3* **in different transcription factor deletion backgrounds**

To determine if the predicted transcription factors might have a role in *STR3* regulation, we examined the regulation of *STR3* in different transcription factor deletion genetic backgrounds under sulphur de-repressed and repressed conditions. (Figure 3.8)

Figure 3.8: *STR3* regulation in strains deleted for different transcription factors (a) Nonsulphur related transcription factors (b) Sulphur related transcription factors.

We observed that among non-sulphur related transcription factors, *gcn4∆* leads to drastic decrease in *STR3* expression under de-repressed condition (2µM Methionine) which suggests an important role of GCN4 for complete de-repression of *STR3.*

In case of the sulphur related transcription factors, decrease in de-repression values of *STR3* in *cbf1∆* and *met31∆* strains suggesting the role of *CBF1* and *MET31* in transcriptional regulation of *STR3.* Furthermore, the decline in extent of repression of *STR3* gene under sulphur sufficient conditions in a *met31∆* strain is indicative of a greater role of *MET31* in regulation of *STR3.*

3.4 Deletion analysis of *STR3* **promoter in sulphur de-repressed and repressed conditions**

To identify the cis-regulatory elements involved in the regulation of *STR3*, we carried out deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter. GFP based assays were performed with yeast strains transformed with truncated promoter-fusion constructs (-600, -440, -395, -363, -288, -256) (Figure 3.9)

Figure 3.9: Schematic representation of constructs made for deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter

We observed that MOTIF A and B did not affect the expression of *STR3* under either sulphur de-repressed or repressed conditions. This suggests that MOTIF A and B are not crucial for expression of *STR3.* However in the -363 promoter construct, deletion of MOTIF C (putative GCN4 motif) leads to sufficient decrease in expression in sulphur de-repressed conditions. This is consistent with our previous result that GCN4 indeed is crucial for full de-repression of *STR3.*(Figure 3.10)

Figure3.10: Deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter by methionine and glutathione sulphur sources

3.5 Mutational analysis of MET31/32 motifs for their involvement in sulphur regulation

We carried out 2 bp and 5 bp mutation in putative MET31/32 Motif B,D and F. 2bp mutation in each of the motif leads to decrease in extent of de-repression value of *STR3* but did not affect the repressed expression significantly.(Figure 3.11)However this was not consistent with the 5bp mutation results. These experiments need to be repeated. From these results we concluded that may be these MET31/32 motifs are working redundantly.

Figure 3.11: Identification of functionally important MET31/32 motifs in *STR3* promoter through mutational analysis

3.6 *STR3* **regulation during intracellular cystine overload**

Previous experiments in the lab have examined how cells responded to cysteine or cystine overload. In these experiments, either the cysteine transporter (YCT1) or a cystine transporter (CgCYN1) were overexpressed and these cells were treated with 500µM cysteine and cystine respectively. Microarray done under these conditions revealed that *STR3* was upregulated (Deshpande et al., 2017).We therefore thought of confirming these results with the STR3-pro-GFP reporter constructs in cells expressing the cystine transporters under similar conditions.

In contrast to the microarray results, we observed a downregulation of *STR3* (Figure3.12) with the 600bp-promoter GFP construct. The discrepancy of this data with microarray data is not clear and needs to be further investigated. The experiments were also done in a *yct1∆* background to minimize any effects from residual cysteine.

Figure 3.12: Effects of elevated levels of extracellular cystine on *STR3* regulation in wild type and *yct1∆ strain*

3.7 Role of conserved MOTIF A (Ume6 and Gln3 binding motif) in nitrogen regulation of *STR3*

Motif A corresponds to site for Ume6 and Gln3 binding motif. These are transcription factors involved in nitrogen regulation. To examine regulation of *STR3* by nitrogen sources, the reporter assay was carried out by growing cells in repressing (ammonium sulphate, ammonium chloride) and in non-repressing nitrogen sources (sodium glutamate). The nitrogen assimilatory pathway is known to be de-repressed by glutamate. No significant difference in de-repression value of cells grown in repressible and non-repressible nitrogen sources was observed and therefore it appears that *STR3* is not under nitrogen regulation.(Figure3.13) To further investigate the nitrogen regulation of *STR3* we examined STR3-promoter-GFP reporter in strains having *ume6Δ* and *ure2Δ* which are repressors of nitrogen regulatory pathway. However, we did not observe any increased activity. We also checked in *gln3Δ* background. GLN3 is a transcriptional activator of nitrogen regulatory network. But, no change in activity was observed. **(**Figure3.13)

Figure 3.13: Effect of different nitrogen sources and regulators of nitrogen pathway on *STR3* regulation

3.8 STR3 expression analysis in *met12Δ and met12Δmet15Δ*

Previous experiments in our lab have shown that strains bearing a *met12∆met15∆* double deletion are unable to utilize GSH/cysteine as sulphur source. In contrast *met15∆* strains which are organic sulphur auxotrophs were able to grow on GSH/cysteine. This block in utilization of GSH/cysteine by *met12∆met15∆* double deletion strain was eventually traced to the *STR3* step.(Bhatia M. unpublished) These studies have suggested that *met12∆* was interfering with *STR3* activity. To evaluate whether the block is at the transcriptional level we investigated whether the expression levels of *STR3* differ in WT and *met12∆met15∆.* We also examined *STR3* expression levels in *met13∆* and *met13∆met15∆* strain as *MET12* is a sequence homolog of *MET13* (though functionally they are different)*.*

We observed comparable de-repression of *STR3* in both WT and *met12∆met15∆* suggesting that there is no transcriptional block at the *STR3* step in *met12∆met15∆.* (Figure3.14)

Figure 3.14: Checking transcriptional block at *STR3* step in *met12∆met15∆*

3.9 Yeast Two Hybrid Assay to check physical interaction between *MET12* **and** *STR3*

Since no transcriptional block of *STR3* by *met12∆met15∆* was observed, we examined whether physical interaction between *MET12* and *STR3* might explain the phenotype observations with *met12∆met15∆.*This was done by using yeast two hybrid assay*.* In one case we used *MET12* as bait and *STR3* as prey and in other case we used *STR3* as bait and *MET12* as prey. However in both the cases we could not observe any physical interaction. (Figure 3.15)

SD+Leu

 $SD + \beta gal$

Figure 3.15: Yeast two hybrid assay to check physical interaction between *MET12* and *STR3*

3.10 Summary and Conclusions –

In this study, we attempted to understand the regulation of *STR3* which seems to be an important regulatory node in sulphur metabolism.

Phylogenetic footprinting data revealed the presence of several conserved motifs in *STR3* promoter region. Further studies for examining the *STR3* regulation were done using STR3 promoter-GFP reporter fusions*.* Strong repression of *STR3* was achieved both by methionine and cysteine (but not by glutathione which is known to be a mild repressor).

Transcription factor deletion experiments demonstrated a drastic decrease in *STR3* expression under sulphur de-repressed conditions for *gcn4Δ* background among the non-sulphur related transcription factors suggesting possible role of *GCN4* for complete de-repression of *STR3*. Among the sulphur related transcription factors, both *cbf1∆* and *met31∆* cause a mild decrease in *STR3* expression on the contrary *met28∆* leads to mild increase of *STR3* levels under sulphur de-repressed conditions. Even more, *met31∆* leads to decline in extent of repression while using methionine as sulphur source indicating a major role of *MET31* in regulation of STR3 by sulphur sources.

From deletion analysis of *STR3* promoter, we identified that Motif A (putative *UME6*) and Motif B (putative *MET31/32*) are not playing major role in *STR3* expression. Further the deletion of MOTIF C (putative *GCN4* motif) suggested a possible role of *GCN4* for complete de-repression of *STR3*. Mutational studies of individual *MET31/32* motifs present in *STR3* promoter could not depict any role of these motifs individually.

STR3 also did not appear to be upregulated by elevated levels of intracellular cystine.

Our data shows that *STR3* gene is not regulated by nitrogen source despite the presence of conserved region for the binding of nitrogen pathway regulators (*UME6*,*GLN3*).

While deciphering the link between *MET12* and *STR3*, we didn't find any transcriptional block at *STR3* step in *met12∆met15∆* and also didn't observe physical interaction between *MET12* and *STR3* in yeast two hybrid assay.

The reason why *STR3* promoter has so many conserved regions and what role exactly they are playing is still unclear.

Bibliography

- 1. Boer, V. M., de Winde, J. H., Pronk, J. T., and Piper, M. D. (2003). The genome-wide transcriptional responses of Saccharomyces cerevisiae grown on glucose in aerobic chemostat cultures limited for carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, or sulfur. *J Biol Chem* **278**, 3265-74.
- 2. Chattopadhyay, M. K., Chen, W., Poy, G., Cam, M., Stiles, D., and Tabor, H. (2009). Microarray studies on the genes responsive to the addition of spermidine or spermine to a Saccharomyces cerevisiae spermidine synthase mutant. *Yeast* **26**, 531-44.
- 3. Courchesne, W. E., and Magasanik, B. (1988). Regulation of nitrogen assimilation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae: roles of the URE2 and GLN3 genes. *Journal of bacteriology* **170**, 708-713.
- 4. Daignan-Fornier, B., and Fink, G. (1992). Coregulation of purine and histidine biosynthesis by the transcriptional activators BAS1 and BAS2. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **89**, 6746-6750.
- 5. Deshpande, A. A., Bhatia, M., Laxman, S., and Bachhawat, A. K. (2017). Thiol trapping and metabolic redistribution of sulfur metabolites enable cells to overcome cysteine overload. *Microbial Cell* **4**, 112-126.
- 6. Fernandes, L., Rodrigues-Pousada, C., and Struhl, K. (1997). Yap, a novel family of eight bZIP proteins in Saccharomyces cerevisiae with distinct biological functions. *Molecular and Cellular Biology* **17**, 6982-6993.
- 7. Hinnebusch, A. G., and Natarajan, K. (2002). Gcn4p, a master regulator of gene expression, is controlled at multiple levels by diverse signals of starvation and stress. *Eukaryotic Cell* **1**, 22-32.
- 8. Kaiser, P., Flick, K., Wittenberg, C., and Reed, S. I. (2000). Regulation of transcription by ubiquitination without proteolysis: Cdc34/SCFMet30 mediated inactivation of the transcription factor Met4. *Cell* **102**, 303-314.
- 9. Kohli, D. K., Srikanth, C. V., and Bachhawat, A. K. (2004). A search tool for identification and analysis of conserved sequence patterns in Saccharomyces spp. orthologous promoters. *in silico Biology* **4**, 411-415.
- 10. Kuge, S., Jones, N., and Nomoto, A. (1997). Regulation of yAP‐1 nuclear localization in response to oxidative stress. *The EMBO journal* **16**, 1710-1720.
- 11. Lee, T. A., Jorgensen, P., Bognar, A. L., Peyraud, C., Thomas, D., and Tyers, M. (2010). Dissection of combinatorial control by the Met4 transcriptional complex. *Mol Biol Cell* **21**, 456-69.
- 12. Magasanik, B., and Kaiser, C. A. (2002). Nitrogen regulation in Saccharomycescerevisiae. *Gene* **290**, 1-18.
- 13. Mori, K., Kawahara, T., Yoshida, H., Yanagi, H., and Yura, T. (1996). Signalling from endoplasmic reticulum to nucleus: transcription factor with a basic‐leucine zipper motif is required for the unfolded protein‐response pathway. *Genes to Cells* **1**, 803-817.
- 14. Okazaki, S., Tachibana, T., Naganuma, A., Mano, N., and Kuge, S. (2007). Multistep disulfide bond formation in Yap1 is required for sensing and transduction of H 2 O 2 stress signal. *Molecular cell* **27**, 675-688.
- 15. Sambrook, J., Fritsch, E. F., and Maniatis, T. (1989). "Molecular cloning: a laboratory manual," Cold spring harbor laboratory press.
- 16. Strich, R., Surosky, R. T., Steber, C., Dubois, E., Messenguy, F., and Esposito, R. E. (1994). UME6 is a key regulator of nitrogen repression and meiotic development. *Genes & development* **8**, 796-810.
- 17. Tai, S. L., Boer, V. M., Daran-Lapujade, P., Walsh, M. C., de Winde, J. H., Daran, J. M., and Pronk, J. T. (2005). Two-dimensional transcriptome analysis in chemostat cultures. Combinatorial effects of oxygen availability and macronutrient limitation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *J Biol Chem* **280**, 437- 47.
- 18. Teixeira, M. C., Monteiro, P. T., Guerreiro, J. F., Gonçalves, J. P., Mira, N. P., dos Santos, S. C., Cabrito, T. R., Palma, M., Costa, C., and Francisco, A. P. (2014). The YEASTRACT database: an upgraded information system for the analysis of gene and genomic transcription regulation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Nucleic acids research* **42**, D161-D166.
- 19. Thomas, D., and SurdinKerjan, Y. (1997). Metabolism of sulfur amino acids in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* **61**, 503-&.